November 1, 1994

Distribution w/encl:

Docket FileEJordan, D/AEODPUBLICGHill (2)PD3-3 ReadingACRS(10)WRussell/FMiragliaOPARZimmermanOC/LFDCBRSpessard, D/DRILEGreenman, RIIIJLieberman, D/OEBMcCabe, 017 G21

Mr. John P. Stetz Sr. Vice President- Nuclear Centerior Service Company c/o Toledo Edison Company Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station 5501 North State Route 2 Oak Harbor, OH 43449

SUBJECT: EXEMPTION FROM 10 CFR 50 APPENDIX J REQUIREMENTS - DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 1 (TAC NO. M90649)

Dear Mr. Stetz:

In response to your letter dated October 21, 1994, the Commission has issued the enclosed Exemption from 10 CFR 50, Appendix J, Section III.D.2(b)(ii), issued pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12.

The Exemption allows a reduced pressure test of the containment air lock seals to fulfill the testing requirements specified in Appendix J, Section III.D.2(b)(ii) providing that no work is performed on the containment air locks that could affect air lock sealing capabilities during the periods covered by the requirement. The Exemption is being forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

> Sincerely, Original signed by Elinor G. Adensam

Elinor G. Adensam, Acting Director Division of Reactor Projects III/IV Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-346

Enclosure: Exemption

cc w/encl: See next page

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\DAVISBES\DB90649.EXE *See previous concurrence To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without attachment/enclosure "E" = Copy with attachment/enclosure

OFFICE	LA:PDNA-3/E	PM:PDIII-3 E	C:SCSB E	D:PDIII-3 €	ÓGC	D: DRAW (1)
NAME	MRushbrook	LGundrum 3BH	RBarrett*	CCarpenter*	CMarco*	Ree
DATE	11/ \ /94	11/ /94 for	10/21/94	10/24/94	10/24 /94	0///94

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

100000

411040191 941101

ADOCK

05000346

PDR

Mr. John P. Stetz Toledo Edison Company

cc: Mary E. O'Reilly Centerior Energy Corporation 300 Madison Avenue Toledo, Ohio 43652

Mr. William T. O'Connor, Jr. Manager - Regulatory Affairs Toledo Edison Company Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Plant 5501 North State - Route 2 Oak Harbor, Ohio 43449

Gerald Charnoff, Esq. Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge 2300 N Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20037#

Regional Administrator U.S. NRC, Region III 801 Warrenville Road Lisle, Illinois 60523-4351

Mr. Robert B. Borsum Babcock & Wilcox Nuclear Power Generation Division 1700 Rockville Pike, Suite 525 Rockville, Maryland 20852

Resident Inspector U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission 5503 N. State Route 2 Oak Harbor, Ohio 43449

Mr. John K. Wood, Plant Manager Toledo Edison Company Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station 5501 North State Route 2 Oak Harbor, Ohio 43449 Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station Unit No. 1

Robert E. Owen, Chief Bureau of Radiological Health Service Ohio Department of Health P. O. Box 118 Columbus, Ohio 43266-0118 Attorney General Department of Attorney General 30 East Broad Street Columbus, Ohio 43216 Mr. James W. Harris, Director Division of Power Generation Ohio Department of Industrial Regulations P. 0. Box 825 Columbus, Ohio 43216 Ohio Environmental Protection Agency DERR--Compliance Unit ATTN: Zack A. Clayton P. O. Box 1049

Columbus, Ohio 43266-0149

State of Ohio Public Utilities Commission 180 East Broad Street Columbus, Ohio 43266-0573

Mr. James R. Williams State Liaison to the NRC Adjutant General's Department Office of Emergency Management Agency 2825 West Granville Road Columbus, Ohio 43235-2712

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of

The Toledo Edison Company, Centerior Service Company, and the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company Docket No. 50-346

EXEMPTION

Ι.

The Toledo Edison Company, Centerior Service Company, and the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company (the licensees) hold Facility Operating License No. NPF-3, which authorizes operation of the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1. The license provides, among other things, that the facility is subject to all rules, regulations, and Orders of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) now or hereafter in effect.

The facility is a pressurized water reactor located at the licensee's site in Ottawa County, Ohio.

II.

Section III.D.2(b)(ii) of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J requires that a full pressure air lock leakage test be performed whenever air locks are opened during periods when containment integrity is not required.

III.

By letter dated October 21, 1994, the licensee requested an Exemption from the requirement of 10 CFR 50, Appendix J, Section III.D.2(b)(ii) identified in Section II above. If an air lock is opened during Modes 5 and 6, Section III.D.2(b)(ii) of Appendix J requires that an overall air lock leakage test at not-less-than the calculated peak containment pressure from a design-basis loss of coolant accident (Pa) be conducted before plant heatup and startup (i.e., before entering Mode 4). Instead, if no maintenance has been performed on the air locks that affects air lock sealing capabilities,

9411040200 941101 PDR ADOCK 05000346 PDR the licensee would conduct an air lock seal leakage test (Section III.D.2(b)(iii) of 10 CFR 50, Appendix J), for the full pressure air lock test required by Section III.D.2(b)(ii).

If the periodic six-month test of Section III.D.2(b)(i) of Appendix J and the test required by Section III.D.2(b)(iii) of Appendix J are current, and no maintenance has been performed on the air lock that affects air lock sealing capabilities, there should be no reason to expect the air lock to leak excessively, just because it has been opened in Mode 5 or Mode 6. If maintenance has been performed, which could affect air lock sealing capability, then a full-pressure air lock test will be performed following such maintenance.

The licensee's letter dated October 21, 1994, submitted information to identify the special circumstances for granting this exemption to Davis-Besse, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12. The purpose of Appendix J to 10 CFR 50, is to assure that containment leak-tight integrity can be verified periodically, throughout service lifetime to maintain containment leakage, within the limits specified in the facility Technical Specifications. The proposed alternative test method, along with the six-month test requirement of Section III.D.2(b)(i) of Appendix J, and the testing requirements when maintenance is performed on the air lock that affects sealing capability, is sufficient to achieve this underlying purpose, in that it provides adequate assurance of continued leak-tight integrity of the air lock.

Based on the above discussion, the licensee's proposed substitution of an air lock seal leakage test described in III.D.2(b)(iii) for a full-pressure test, as discussed above, is acceptable.

- 2 -

Accordingly, the Commission has determined that, pursuant to 1D CFR 50.12, this exemption is authorized by law, and will not present an undue risk to the public health and safety, and is consistent with the common defense and security. The Commission further determines that special circumstances described by 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii) exist, in that application of the regulation in the particular circumstances is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule, since the licensees have proposed an acceptable alternative method that accomplishes the intent of the regulation.

Accordingly, the Commission hereby grants the Exemption as described in Section III above from the requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix J, Section III.D.2(b)(ii).

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32, the Commission has determined that the granting of this Exemption will have no significant impact on the quality of the human environment (59 FR 54222).

This Exemption is effective upon issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Elinon J. adensam

Elinor G. Adensam, Acting Director Division of Reactor Projects III/IV Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this \ day of November 1994